CONFIDENTIAL

30 June 1966

DEVELOPMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHIC PRINT STRAIGHTENER

1. PROBLEM.

To develop a print straightener which will accept photographic prints up to 30 inches in width.

2. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM.

a. Newly processed photographic prints have a decided curl due to the differential drying of the emulsion and the paper base, making them difficult to handle unless flattened by a print straightener.

b. Commercially available print straighteners will not accept photographic prints greater than 16 inches in width.

3. DISCUSSION.

a. Current Procedure: Large photographic prints are presently delivered to the user in a curled condition, leaving the problem of falttening the prints to the ingenuity of the user. This procedure usually results in the necessity of mounting the prints on a hard-board base for any intended use.

b. Origin of Concept: By a memorandum dated 7 July 1965, the Production Services Division, NPIC, stated a requirement for two print straighteners capable of handling prints 26 to 30 inches in width and requested the Plans and Development Staff to investigate the feasibility of a wide print straightener. Such investigation was conducted, considering commercially available equipment, modifications to commercial equipment, and/or new designs. It was determined that the commercial equipment could not be modified to

meet the requirement and a new design was necessary to handle the large size prints.

c. Proposed Program: This project is for the development of a prototype print straightener capable of handling photographic prints up to 30 inches in width. Dependent upon the test and evaluation of the prototype, an improved version is also planned. Operational and maintenance literature as well as specifications and drawings will be required.

d. Selection of Contractor: Development Objectives were prepared and forwarded to the Office of Logistics in November 1965 for solicitation of proposals. In January 1966 information was received that no formal proposals had resulted from the solicitation. Two local facilities were then informally contacted who had the qualifications and interest in this field. Resultant proposals from both companies [redacted] 25X1
[redacted] were evaluated. [redacted] 25X1
submission was extremely brief and lacking in essential details. Efforts, made by a plant visit and further discussion to obtain more detail, resulted in verbal affirmation, but to date a revised proposal has not been received. It is felt, that although [redacted] 25X1
[redacted] is qulaified and fully aware of the requirements, 25X1
they have applied very little effort and time to the specifics in the proposal, and intend working out the details after being awarded the contract. As a result, and in spite of being the low bidder, further consideration of the [redacted], proposal is 25X1
felt unwarrented.

The [redacted] proposal, on the other hand, is well prepared, 25X1
and indicates that considerable time and effort was expended in

preparation. All details are covered and the design parameters of the several component parts are technically sound. The selection of materials for the various moving parts, tables, sink, etc., are the preferred types for this application. Their approach to the complete operation, such as the addition of water without temperature reduction by means of a compartmented tank, thereby not requiring a shut-down for reheating, indicates their awareness of the requirements. A plant visit was made for inspection of their facilities and discussion of the development objectives, as was made to the other bidder. From this visit and discussion with Librascope representatives, and the thoroughness of their proposal, it is felt the contract award to that company will result in superior equipment.

e. Coordination: The selection of the [redacted] proposal has been coordinated and concurred in by the Production Services Division, NPIC, and by the Plans and Development Staff, NPIC. Since this is a specific requirement of an NPIC operational component, and the deliverable item is a prototype, it is felt that community-wide coordination should not be effected at this time. 25X1

f. Alternatives: (1) Continuation of the present method of requiring hard-back mounting of prints. (2) Acceptance of the lower cost proposal and probable delivery of an inferior piece of equipment.

4. CONCLUSIONS.

The [redacted] proposal evidences complete understanding of the task and well thxought plans for achieving all of the technical requirements. The company has the required personnel and facilities, 25X1

while the funding as quoted seems reasonable and justifable. There is every reason to expect a satisfactory item within the five month schedule and at the cost quoted.

The [redacted] proposal, as mentioned, is lacking in detail, and is stated in such generalities that it is difficult to determine whether or not the technical requirements would be met. 25X1

5. RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is recommended that the proposal of the [redacted] 25X1

[redacted] be accepted for the development of this equipment and that a fixed price contract be negotiated on the basis of the Development Objectives and their proposal. It is further recommended the [redacted] proposal be rejected for the reasons previously stated. 25X1 25X1

6. References & Attachments.

TAB A - R&D Catalog Form

TAB B - Technical Specifications

TAB C - Development Objectives

TAB D - Program Phasing

Attachment - Proposal